REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 24-37 are currently pending in the present application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, 24-25, 27, 29-32, 34 and 36-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wicher et al.* (US 5,977,933) in view of *Singhal et al.* (US 5,488,385). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 24 and 31) now recites a step of "in response to a selection of a concurrent display mode, providing identical information to said first and second memory locations, such that contents displayed on said first display device are identical to contents displayed on said second display device."

On page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed providing step is disclosed by *Wicher* in col. 2, lines 58-63. In col. 2, lines 59-63, *Wicher* teaches that "the novelty here lies in the provision of two video data paths both driven by pixel data supplied by a single video memory (frame buffer) in order to drive independently a CRT display or television display and a flat panel display" (emphasis added). Since *Wicher* teaches the use of a single memory location to store two video data paths, *Wicher*'s teachings is clearly different from the claimed invention that utilizes two separate memory locations.

Wicher specifically teaches that "a portable computer includes a single frame buffer which stores display data for two video data paths, each data path including a display controller which provides display control timing" (col. 2, lines 4-7). Thus, according to *Wicher*, there are two video controllers connected to a single video memory via two separate video data paths. In fact, *Singhal* also teaches the usage of two separate video display controllers in Figure 1, namely, a VGA controller 22 and a VGA controller 22' for accessing a video memory 24 and a video memory 24', respectively. In contrast, the claimed invention recites "a first memory location ... accessible by a video display controller" and "a second memory location ... accessible by said

video display controller." Thus, the claimed invention includes only one video controller for accessing to both the first and second memory locations.

Because the claimed invention recites novel features that are not taught or suggested in the cited references, whether considered separately or in combination, the § 103 rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-7 and 24-37 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 1, 24 and 31 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against IBM Deposit Account No. 50-0563.

Respectfully submitted,

Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., Suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS